

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action dated March 9, 2005. In view of the foregoing amendments and following representations, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Initially, on page 2 of the Office Action, the drawings are objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) because the cross sections recited in claim 1 and claim 10 are not shown. Accordingly, new drawing Figures 2(b) and 2(c) are submitted herewith in order to show the rectangular shape of the cross sections recited in claim 1 and the circular shape of the cross section recited in claim 10. It is submitted that the new figures are straight forward illustrations of the claimed features, and thus do not represent new matter. Note that original Fig. 2 (now Fig. 2(a)) has been amended to indicate the section line corresponding to the cross sections shown in new Figs. 2(b) and 2(c).

Next, to facilitate the Examiner's reconsideration of the application, the abstract has been revised to comply with the guidelines set forth in MPEP 608.01(b). Note that the changes to the abstract are submitted in the form of a substitute abstract. A copy of the originally filed abstract, with changes marked therein, is attached and entitled "Version with Markings to Show Changes Made."

Next, on page 3 of the Office Action, claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. In response, claim 5 has been amended to specifically recite that the dimensions are of the cross section of the throat taken along the major and minor axis. Accordingly, it is submitted that the amendment to claim 5 clearly obviates the rejection of this claim under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Further, on page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicates that claims 6, 7, 9, 13 and 14 would be allowable if rewritten independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, claim 1 has been amended to include all of the limitations of allowable dependent claim 6; claim 9 has been rewritten in independent form so as to include all of the limitations of original claims 1 and 8; and claim 10 has been amended to include all of the limitations of allowable dependent claim 13. Accordingly, independent claims 1, 9 and 10 are clearly allowable. Furthermore, the remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from one of the allowable independent claims, and thus are similarly allowable at least by virtue of their dependencies.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the present application is now clearly in condition for allowance. The Examiner therefore is requested to pass this case to issue.

In the event that the Examiner has any comments or suggestions of a nature necessary to place this case in condition for allowance, then the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney by telephone to promptly resolve any remaining matters.

Respectfully submitted,

Junichi IKEDA

By: 
Michael S. Huppert
Registration No. 40,268
Attorney for Applicant

MSH/kjf
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
June 9, 2005